

JX
1936
.5
J4



hbl, stx

JX1936.5J4

War or sport :



3 9153 00526650 9

JX
1936
.5
J4


WAR OR SPORT

An Endeavor to Contribute a Point of View to the Present
Widespread Discussion on the Organization and
Maintenance of Peace

By
Everett Colgate Jessup

ROSLYN, NEW YORK

1940



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2012 with funding from
LYRASIS Members and Sloan Foundation

<http://archive.org/details/warorspo00jess>

FOREWORD

Several years ago some thoughts of the writer's touching upon the subject of war and peace appeared in the columns of The Princeton Alumni Weekly. Months later from the city of Showchow, Anhwei, in the interior of China came the following letter written by an American missionary a few days before his death. It has been published in "The Letters of Maxwell Chaplin" edited by James Stewart.

My dear Jessup:

. . . Your two articles in the Alumni Weekly have interested me so deeply that I'm moved to write you a letter. I've followed nearly all the Peace movements that have sprung up since the war but with a growing discouragement at the "arm-chair" character of most of them. They didn't touch the well-springs of human action.

You have gripped the central problem, it seems to me. And I do not believe you are overstating the possibility of sports as a sublimating mechanism. Not until one comes to the Orient, where athletics and the traditions of sportsmanship are not a part of the social heritage, does one realize the vital part they play in the education of the individual and the group. The spirit of sportsmanship is not a racial quality, however, that we of the west have and the Orientals not. It is part of our social heritage and has to be accepted and maintained by the individuals as they come to it. It is still largely a class affair at home even yet. It has not been a part of the Chinese social heritage and their whole idea of "face" militates against the idea. They hate to lose, for to lose is to lose "face". The ideal ball-game ends in a tie. Both sides have had a good time and nobody has lost. Now this poor sportsmanship is not a national or racial affair. When Chinese school boys in Shanghai and other centers are brought up in the sporting tradition and atmosphere they become excellent sportsmen, as the Japanese

already have. I ran against Chinese, Japanese and Philippinoes in the Far Eastern Olympics in Shanghai. The level of sportsmanship at that meet was as high as any I have ever taken part in at home.

The power of sport to sublimate the spirit of rebellion and trouble-making among Chinese students has been demonstrated in a nearby university where, in spite of the intense nationalistic and anti-foreign propaganda, the student body has carried on with splendid spirit. . . .

Sincerely yours,

MAXWELL CHAPLIN.

Let this letter be the introduction to the thoughts that follow. It is well to think about unsolved things and of all unsolved things of vital concern to man none is more worthy of thought, none offers a more fascinating field for inquiry than this question of ending war.

E.C.J.



March 15th, 1940

CONTENTS

PAGE

I

Man as a Fighting Animal.....	5
-------------------------------	---

II

Philosophers and War.....	11
---------------------------	----

III

Voluntarily Accepted Tragedy.....	15
-----------------------------------	----

IV

The Sublimation of Instincts.....	19
-----------------------------------	----

V

Sport as a Sublimation for War.....	24
Appendix	30

I

*"Dream ye of peaceful sway?
Dream on, who dream it may.
War still is empire's word.
Peace? By the victor's sword."*

—GOETHE

Man is a fighting animal. Notwithstanding the widespread biological and general knowledge of our day, there are many who doubt it. Are there not sufficient facts to establish its truth? -

With the person who believes that man and the world began at 4004 B. C., there is nothing to discuss, as *recorded, authentic history since that date* is one bath of blood, a countless succession of wars with short, peaceful intervals preparing for more wars. Lapouge, a French writer, has figured out that the wars of a century spill 120,000,000 gallons of blood, enough to fill 3,000,000 forty-gallon casks, or to create a perpetual fountain sending up a jet of 150 gallons per hour, a fountain which has been flowing unceasingly since the dawn of recorded history.

With the evolutionist and the near-evolutionist the facts are not so definite. Knowledge of prehistoric man is fragmentary at best and much that we consider truth is really surmise. The facts, as they stand today, as revealed by anthropology and archaeology, are that paleolithic man (early stone age, 50,000 years or so ago) was primarily a hunter living in family or small tribal groups who, with few weapons, maintained himself by constant physical struggle with his environment. Neolithic man appearing about 10,000 to 12,000 years ago turned his attention to agriculture and domestication of animals and industry, living in compact communities and accumulating property. Organized war as distinguished from individual or tribal fighting probably dates from this time and continues down to the present.

For the true evolutionist the fact that civilized man, as a result of the survival of the fittest in a world of universal conflict, occupies the place in nature that he does is *ipso facto* proof of his powerful fighting abilities. "Man, biologically considered, is the most formidable of all beasts of prey."

Whether there were species of men who did not fight we cannot tell. As William James aptly remarked: "Like dead men, dead causes tell no tales, and the ideals that went under in the past, along with all the tribes that represented them, find today no recorder, no explainer, no defender."

Under the influence of Greek culture and Christianity man has come to live increasingly in a world of idealization, of make-believe, of things as they ought to be. He has been looking upward so much that he does not realize his feet still tread the same old earth as the man of the Stone age. Poets and saints have dreamed of brotherly love and elysian tranquillity. Philosophers have proved the immutability of justice and truth. Idealists have so refined their natures that they believe themselves above all the lusts of the flesh. They live in a world of hopes and not of realities.

One can imagine such a person, oblivious to what is really going on around him, strolling with pen and paper in the summer field composing an ode on the peace and serenity of nature. Under his feet the beautiful wild flower is having the most wretched existence fighting weeds, fungi, insects and bacteria. Nearby we see a cricket overwhelmed and killed by ants and then the whole crowd eaten by a lark. A garden snake passing along swallows alive and whole, a big green grasshopper and is in turn torn to pieces by a hungry hawk. Instead of peace and contentment we have bloodshed and bitter pain—a picture that has often been painted of the survival of the fittest.

The stroller, whose feet have crushed to death several worms and numerous walking insects, sees none of this and because *he* has a full stomach and because no one is interfering with *his* pursuit of happiness, is content. If a bull, however, angered by his waving red tie, should plunge a horn deep into his abdomen transfixing him to the earth, he would no doubt conclude before joining the other dead things in the field that it is not such a peaceful, serene place after all.

Let such a person read George W. Crile's book, *A Mechanistic View of War and Peace*, in which occurs the following rather graphic message:

"The supreme bliss of forgetfulness of the soldier is in the orgy of lustful, satisfying killing in a hand to hand bayonet action when the grunted breath of the enemy is heard and his blood flows warm on the hand. This is a fling back in physiology to the period when man had not controlled fire, had not fashioned weapons, when in mad embrace he tore the flesh with his angry teeth and felt the warm blood flow over his thirsty face. A life-sized photograph giving each detail of the face of a soldier thus transformed in the supreme moment of hand-to-hand combat would give the key to the origin of war."

Modern psychology throws some light upon this subject. The analysis of the emotions reveals some striking conditions in the mind of civilized man that must date far back in the life of the race. One of the most startling is the unconscious death wish, demonstrated often in individuals who consciously would not harm a worm. This and the total unconcern of the uncon-

scious mind towards the death of a stranger lead Sigmund Freud to say in his book *Reflections on War and Death*, "The very emphasis of the commandment 'Thou shalt not kill' makes it certain we are descended from an endlessly long chain of generations of murderers whose love of murder was in their blood as it is perhaps also in ours. . . . Such a powerful inhibition can only be directed against an equally strong impulse."

Another psychological viewpoint on which accurate statistics can not be found, concerns the daily phantasies of large groups of people. A thorough knowledge of "air castles", the phantasy life of the individual, gives a fairly accurate picture of the character of the person. If there be such a thing as group, phantasy life we may see it reflected possibly in the front page of the daily newspaper. The page is designed to interest, for a short period after breakfast, a person who is usually riding in a moving vehicle. It is not an occasion for particularly heavy thinking and the subjects presented are those of most interest, that have the greatest appeal in this rather ideal, phantasy period. A basis for classification is quickly found. Sex and conflict include the vast majority. Any front page that does not have at least one article to stimulate a sex phantasy will probably be in a paper having a declining circulation. The same may be said about conflict, a broad term which has here the significance given it by Havelock Ellis in *The Philosophy of Conflict*. "Conflict is a genus with many species, of which war is only one. . . . War is a form of conflict whose specific trait is violence."

The daily stimuli are wars, distant and near, and rumors of wars, disagreements of all sorts, crimes of violence, catastrophies of natural and human causation, marital belligerency. Seldom do the premiers meet without bitter arguments. Few peace meetings and few religious gatherings appear on the front page without a row in them. Occasionally sporting events, particularly prize fights and football games, are reported there.

The conclusion that may be drawn from this is that on the subjects of love and war "the imagination loves to dally with their possibility!"

If man is then such a wild creature whose "impulse to war is stronger than the desire to live, stronger than the fear of death," how do we explain such phenomena as conscription in war time, the election of 1916 in the United States, man's anxiety to avoid trouble? The answer is fairly simple. Man, like all other animals, when given plenty to fill his stomach and all the possessions he craves, with nothing to bother him and nobody to envy and with an occasional thrill thrown in, will bask in the sun content; that is, all but a few souls who, restless with the creative instinct, are never content. Interfere with his possessions, his food, or his ideals—thwart him—and he will protest and fight, the latter reaction varying with different peoples and different individuals, being directly proportional to the amount of pugnacity and the intensity of the stimulus. A husband's willingness or

unwillingness to scold the cook depends on the character of the husband and the nature of the offense. A *normal* man, informed that the cook has beaten his only child, cut her face, knocked out her front teeth and disfigured her for life, will not say to his wife, "Well, dear, you speak to her".

In the case of war the most pugnacious individuals will fight willingly; so will others as each sees his own property or possessions or ideals threatened. Some who do not feel themselves in danger are forced to fight to protect the others and in obedience to the feelings of the majority.

A striking illustration of the foregoing argument in the case of an individual is the war career of the late Dr. David Starr Jordan, president emeritus of Leland Stanford University and one of the most noted pacifists in the United States. He had preached against war for many years and when it came, continued to preach against it. After many months had passed, it began to dawn upon him that the Germans were really threatening his ideals and he did a right about face and became a militarist for the remainder of the war. This highly intelligent and patriotic citizen was simply in his feelings out of date with the majority of the citizenry, but the influence of years of pacifist feeling and thinking did not prevent his reacting finally to the same stimulus in the same way.

Similar were the reactions of the early radicals in the American Peace Society, a group of about two hundred non-resistants in New England led by Henry Clarke Wright and William Lloyd Garrison, when face to face with abolitionism. In this instance with but few exceptions, the principle of non resistance was not heeded by its most devoted adherents.

Similar are the reactions of the members of the Oxford Union. Most of the present membership are now in uniform notwithstanding their predecessors' vote "That this house will under no circumstance fight for King and Country."

The philosophy and the life of Voltaire present so common an inconsistency that it must be particularly noted. An ardent pacifist on the subject of war he was at the same time in his personal relations to his fellow men a fighter to the last ditch.

The man who *said* "Our God who has bidden us love our enemies and suffer evil without complaint, assuredly has no mind that we should cross the sea to go and cut the throats of our brothers, because murderers in red clothes, and hats two feet high, enlist citizens, making a noise with two little sticks on an ass's skin tightly stretched", *acted* within three years rather differently. Insulted and beaten by the Chevalier de Rohan in an altercation over the possession of the famous actress, Adrienne Lecouvreur, as a mistress, Voltaire retired for four months to an out-of-the-way section of Paris where he assiduously practised fencing. A biographer thus describes a scene at the time: "He does not look like a fighter, but his lips are tightly

clenched his eyes savage—he lunges and parries with a vigor extraordinary in a man of so puny a build. Voltaire intends to cut out the Chevalier's heart with his own hand. For once the man of thought has cast aside words as useless and taken up the sword. His only regret now as he jumps around to the orders of the professional cut-throats who are coaching him is, not that of his father why did he not go into a profession, but why did he not take up fencing earlier?"

So acted a philosopher who preached the brotherhood of man. So do all sane human beings act, obedient to the stimulus — emotion — action syndrome, thwarting — anger — fighting. The pacifist by specious reasoning and by voluntary repression of his herd instincts can witness with equanimity his country's honor trammled in the dust, but a blow against his personal honor is not borne with quite so much composure. So often similar specious reasoning demands of the state, lofty and altruistic ideals and virtues which its individual members do not possess.

The fighting impulse is stronger as a defensive, protective measure and modern wars are really waged on the principle of defense. All that is needed to arouse the people to fighting pitch is to show the presence of danger. Observers have reported that there is hardly a citizen of Germany who does not believe that the world war was a war of defense, Germany protecting herself from the ring of enemies that hemmed her in.

The slogan which won the election of 1916 in the United States won because the majority of the citizenry felt that the country and its possessions were in no danger. War finally came when the feeling arose that its form of government and its ideals of democracy were threatened.

Man has achieved his place in the world through force, has fought his way to the top and the specialization that has put him there, the devising and use of weapons of increasingly great power, bids fair to be his undoing. It would be but following the well-established, biological formula of increasing specialization leading to lessened adaptability, and lessened adaptability in this particular world means extinction and death.

All this however does not explain the biological anomaly of war. The wholesale murder of his own species by man is a spectacle unique in the animal kingdom.

The anomaly is due to several factors. Man's intense gregariousness tends to divide him into groups which act biologically as different species. The gregariousness cultivates an antagonism to the stranger, or the one outside the herd, which greatly magnifies thwarting stimuli. Due also to the possession of the faculties of speaking and writing, man is irritated far more than other animals. Propaganda uses these faculties and anger and war are easily brewed from the printed page and from the rostrum. Added to all this is man's great acquisitiveness. Accumulating property, food and

goods in a world where such commodities are unequally divided is a thwarting agent that constantly menaces. J. J. Rousseau tells us that man's troubles began when he marked out a square of ground and setting his foot upon it said, "This is mine"; and one of Solon's favorite sayings was, "Equality causes no war".

A fourth important factor is man's creative and destructive faculties. The destructive impulse is the terrible penalty man pays for being a creator. Having built, he derives greatest satisfaction from demolishing - to build another and better. This applies not only to physical things but to civilizations. The thoughts of the poet echo through the centuries:

"Ah friend, could you and I with him conspire
To grasp this sorry scheme of things entire,
Would not we shatter it to bits
And then remold it nearer to the heart's desire?"

H. B. Marshall, in his book, *War and the Ideals of Peace*, after many pages devoted to a discussion of natural laws and customs, nature of ideals and conflicts of ideals, concludes apparently unwillingly, "Yes, we must grant that man is by nature a fighting animal."

Man *is* a fighting animal — an infinitely cruel, savage, relentless, fighting animal and any "dreamer of peaceful sway" not recognizing this is but thinking in the stuff of dreams. Permanent peace may come — not by the fiat of man's law repressing the expression of one of man's most fundamental instincts, but by the sublimation of this incredibly vast store of pugnacious energy into the creative arts, the worship of the beautiful, true religion, clean sport, and the spirit of sportsmanship.

II

*"From peace proceedeth prosperitie,
From prosperitie proceedeth riches,
From riches proceedeth pride,
From pride proceedeth voluptuousness,
From voluptuousness proceedeth envy,
From envy proceedeth war,
From war proceedeth poverty,
From poverty proceedeth humility,
From humility proceedeth patience,
From patience cometh again peace."*

—THE CYCLE OF THE AGES
From an old, illuminated MS.

Those who are generally considered to have done the best thinking have rather neglected the subject of war and peace. It is surprising that the most persistent and all-engrossing activity of the past ten thousand years — murdering the members of one's own species, a distinct biological anomaly — is touched upon in so few words by the great philosophers!

Up to the time of the Renaissance the thinking of the European world in the realms of philosophy, morals and religion was almost wholly determined by two men — Aristotle and Christ. Aristotle was a militarist, who gloried in the life of the soldier fighting for a just cause, who held that man's highest ethical state was laying down his life with courage and devotion on the field of battle and who even went so far as to advocate imperialistic war for the express purpose of reducing to slavery people apparently so destined by nature.

Christ was a pacifist, a preacher of non-resistance, whose followers practised this teaching for over two hundred years. Christ's pacifism, however, is not as clear cut as this contrast would lead one to assume. There may be cited in paralleled columns quotations from the New Testament that give totally contradictory statements. Furthermore, his philosophy of non-resistance, with its punishment in the next world of the evil-doer, offers the man of great faith the satisfaction of a vicarious revenge that helps him bear his ills with resignation.

In the course of succeeding centuries, however, the doctrine of the ascendancy of the spiritual power, supported by the growth in the temporal power of the church and the acceptance of its titular head as the representa-

tive of God on earth, led men thus placed in positions of omnipotency to do the very thing which God declares (through man!) He will do Himself; "Vengeance is mine, saith the Lord, I will repay." In other words, esteeming themselves as at one with the God-head they assumed the divine prerogative. It was not long before the earth was drenched with blood spilled in the name of Christ and of His Church and the minds of men corrupted with the thought "the end justifies the means." Those who may find a certain inconsistency in the commandment, may find its counterpart in the relation of the state to its citizens. During war every vicious act known to man is made use of by the State which still demands every virtue from the citizen.

Thus the thoughts of men for two thousand years were swayed by a militarist who possessed probably, the keenest intelligence that the world has ever known and by One over Whose pacifist teaching, as revealed by His disciples, rests a cloud of contradiction. Christ's tremendous moral power and idealistic philosophy of life changed the religious conceptions of mankind, yet affected so little the activity that has influenced men's lives more than any other. In fact no wars have been more cruel, no massacres more savage than those perpetrated in the name of religion. The very bishops of the Church have led their troops in battle and killed with their own hands!

The vast majority of philosophers during this period took war, apparently, as a matter of course. Marcus Aurelius wrote his beautiful meditations in camp between battles. Philosophy concerned itself chiefly with metaphysical problems. The age-old discussions on epistemology in which the best minds lost themselves, did not help the ordinary citizen solve his problems, buy his bread or keep it after he had gotten it. As John Dewey has remarked "As I read Plato philosophy began with some sense of its essentially political basis and mission — a recognition that its problems were those of the organization of a just social order. But it soon got lost in dreams of another world."

The philosophy of the Renaissance was directly inspired and stimulated by the labors of Francis Bacon whose work "moved the intellects which moved the world" — even to the present day. He also was a militarist. "Let it suffice," he wrote in *The Greatness of Kingdoms and Estates*, "that no state expect to be great that is not awakened upon any just occasion of arming. . . . A just and honorable war is the true exercise . . . in a slothful peace both courage will effeminate and warrior corrupt."

With Bacon philosophy began to concern itself once more with the real needs and aspirations of mankind, the "philosophy of the enlightenment" as Hibben calls it. With the increasing interest in social philosophy goes, of course, an increasing interest in the subject of war and peace.

With the exception of one man, Nietzsche, a militarist, who wrote, "Ye may say that it is the good cause which halloweth every war. I say unto you it is the good war which halloweth every cause," the consideration of war is of minor interest in philosophic thinking. Even James and Dewey and Bergson in endeavoring to make philosophy a real and vital thing have written very few pages on this unsolved problem.

Schopenhauer tells us that the fear of death is the beginning of philosophy and the final cause of religion. Is it not a strange commentary that war, the activity of life that is most concerned with death has been so little considered by either?

Surely our great philosophers have visioned *some* paths to peace that are worth following. They have visioned many but the paths are long and none has yet been followed far.

Plato considered there were two causes of war, over-population and foreign trade, and advocated the simple remedies of restricting growth of population by abortion and infanticide and by limiting foreign trade! To end the civil wars among the Greeks he advocated a Greek league of nations.

Hugo Grotius, a lawyer-philosopher, published in 1625 his monumental work "De Jure Belli et Pacis". Of all that has been said or written about war in this or any other period none has had a more profound effect. Written at a time when war had touched the very dregs of bestial cruelty, it brought a little order out of chaos, gave men a vision of the necessity, if fighting were to go on, of abiding by a few rules and became the foundation on which has been built the structure of international law.

The keen mind of Herbert Spencer concluded that the rise of industrialism would mean the end of war. Yet after one hundred years of industrialism occurred the greatest war of history!

One thinks of chauvinistic German thought as the epitome of militarism yet there lived in Germany, just a little over a hundred years ago, one of the greatest philosophers of the world, Emanuel Kant, who wrote a treatise, "Perpetual Peace", in which he held that war is the overthrow of all good and the origin of most evil. Its main conclusion, that a republican form of government will end war, has still to be proved.

The Kantian doctrine has formed the basis of many peace plans including the present Streit plan of "Union Now" and the Clark plan for a "Federation of Free Peoples".

Bertrand Russell claims that man spends his life endeavoring to gain possession of something or endeavoring to create something. He pleads for the exercise of the creative instinct instead of the prevalent passion for possession, believing that the ambition to create, the desire to make three where there was only one, to make one where there was nothing, exercised

generally by the individuals of a nation, will do away with national feelings of imperialism and so with one of the greatest causes of war.

In William James' opinion any scheme for peace must provide for the maintenance of the manly virtues developed by war and must afford periodical thrills to relieve the ennui of a pacifist civilization. His plan involves the conscription of the youth of the country for a short period of their adolescent years for manual work against the forces of nature. "To coal and iron mines, to freight trains, to fishing fleets in December, to dish washing, clothes washing, window washing, to building roads and tunnel making, to foundries and stoke holes and to frames of sky scrapers would our guilded youth be drafted off according to their choice, to get childishness knocked out of them and to come back into society with healthier sympathies and solider ideas. They would have paid their blood tax, done their part in the immemorial human warfare against nature; they would tread the earth more proudly, the women would value them more highly, they would be better fathers and teachers of the following generation". He concludes, "I have no serious doubt that . . . man . . . is capable of organizing such a moral equivalent as I have sketched or some other just as effective for preserving manliness of type. It is but a question of time, of skillful propagandism and of opinion-making men seizing historic opportunities"

The importance of those last five words cannot be exaggerated. Extraordinary well thought out plans for peace filled with many notions and few feelings fall upon deaf ears. What is needed is "*Opinion-making men seizing historic opportunities*" with appeals as short as these plans are long, as full of feeling as they are of thought. Then something might happen.

Is an historic opportunity NOW?

III

"It (war) is the foundation of all the high virtues and faculties of men . . . It was very strange to me to discover this; and very dreadful. . . . But I saw it to be quite an undeniable truth. The common notion that peace and the virtues of civil life flourish together I found to be wholly untenable. Peace and the vices of civil life only flourish together. We talk of peace and learning, and of peace and plenty, and of peace and civilization, but I found that those were not the words which the Muse of History coupled together; that on her lips the words were peace and sensuality, peace and selfishness, peace and corruption, peace and death. I found, in brief, that all great nations learned their truth of word and strength of thought in war; that they were nourished in war and wasted in peace, trained by war and betrayed by peace; — in a word, that they were born in war and expired in peace."

—JOHN RUSKIN.

Such thoughts cast a rather depressing shadow on the numerous peace projects that continually agitate the mind. "Peace, perfect peace, in this dark world of sin" may not be such a grand idea after all. Dilemmas are disconcerting things! To be damned if we do fight and damned if we do not is not a pleasant prospect. However, dilemma or no dilemma let us proceed. Dilemmas in the fairy tales are always happily solved and maybe there is a way out of this one.

The militarist claims that war is a good thing. The pacifist claims that war is a bad thing. Both have enough arguments supporting their respective views to fill books, arguments which are quite convincing on both sides.

The militarist claims that the heroic qualities developed by war, of courage and self-sacrifice, hardihood and perseverance, intrepidity and chivalry will atrophy in a state of continual peace, and man, weak of will and body, will degenerate into a spineless, timid, contemptible thing. The world will become "a sort of vast hutch of harmless, gentle, highly intellectual and tender-hearted rabbits."

At the same time the pacifist holds that war is a great antagonist to the ethical striving of the race, a destroyer of all that man's spirit is seeking to attain and that the increasing use of great weapons of destruction is threatening civilization itself. Thus the human race is faced by either

degeneration or barbarism and has simply the opportunity of deciding which may be the lesser of the two evils.

As both statements are disputed by those who hold opposite opinions, it is not assuming too much to believe that a fallacy may lurk somewhere. Possibly there is something that will maintain the martial virtues in all their vigor and at the same time not interfere with, but perchance aid, the ethical strivings of mankind.

To seek this out is our purpose.

If peace means social stagnation and degeneration, if man is so adapted by nature as to deteriorate in a semi-permanent peace-pleasure economy, a fact fairly well proven in the crucible of experience, the problem becomes one of not so much abolishing war as *changing peace*. If this were satisfactorily accomplished then possibly war would automatically cease, or be markedly lessened. In many of the acute manias of the individual, manic depressive insanity for instance, if one treats the patient properly during the period of sanity, this period is lengthened and the period of dementia diminished in intensity.

The analogy holds in two respects for it is possible to consider war as an acute psychopathic state of the mass mind.

Changing peace, however, is a problem of infinite magnitude and possibly has never been better summarized than in the words of Elie Faure: "The condition of peace must involve a new method with the same sudden, collective intoxication as war, the same shining responsibilities, the creative risks, the same atmosphere of voluntarily accepted tragedy."

The mere summary of this point of view emphasizes the complexity of the problem. Let us pause a moment to consider the meaning of but the last three words "voluntarily accepted tragedy."

The emotional content of these words may best be felt by reading a few brief extracts from diaries and letters written in the late war. They give vivid glimpses of this feeling, a feeling which seems to sanctify that which is most sordid.

One diarist, whose spare hours before death were spent in a fairly gross pursuit of personal pleasure, wrote at the same time: "I haven't lived very well, but I am determined to die well. . . . I want to die as a man should, a man of courage and spirit, and thank God, I am going to have the opportunity to die as every brave man should wish to die — fighting, and fighting for my country as well. . . . I tell you there is some pleasure in losing one's life as I am going to. I wouldn't give it for a thousand years of peace and plenty at home. . . . And I have always longed for better things, but I didn't know how to go about getting them. But now fate has

tossed me this glorious opportunity. I must make the best of it, all I have to pay for it is my life. I must make it worth the bargain."

How like the thought of Sir Walter Scott:-

"Sound, sound the clarion, fill the fife!
To all the sensual world proclaim,
One crowded hour of glorious life
Is worth an age without a name."

In the Life and Letters of Walter H. Page, American Ambassador to Great Britain, we read: "Upon my word, if one could forget the awful tragedy all this experience would be worth a lifetime of commonplace. . . . Old ladies and gentlemen of the high titled world now begin by driving to my house almost every morning while I am at breakfast. With many apologies for calling so soon and with the fear that they interrupt me, they ask if I can make an inquiry in Germany for 'my son' or 'my nephew' — 'he's among the missing'. They never weep, their voices do not falter, they are brave and proud and self-restrained. It seems a sort of matter of course to them."

A poet who wrote "I Have a Rendez-vous with Death", and who kept that rendez-vous, wrote to his mother: "You must not be anxious about my not coming back. . . . Death is nothing terrible after all. It may mean something even more wonderful than life. It cannot possibly mean anything worse to the good soldier. . . . If I do not come out, I will share the good fortunes of those who disappear at the pinnacle of their careers."

We recall Ruskin's further words, "We worship the soldier not because he goes forth to slay — but to be slain." We recall Aristotle's praise of war. Was it not this feeling of voluntarily accepted tragedy that made war noble to Aristotle? For underlying this feeling is the conception that the physical life is not of great worth on its own account but only as the instrument of some higher use.

The foregoing are but examples of what every officer who censored letters during the World War read fairly frequently — for a while. This elan, this spirit of sacrificing the physical body in a great cause, this sublime renunciation of self is surely one of the most extraordinary phenomena that life has to offer. Many have endeavored to explain it. The cold language of the sociological psychology of Wilfred Trotter would ascribe it to the overwhelming domination by the herd instinct of the individual urge to self-preservation. Is it not part of the general principle touched on by Christ when He said, "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends?"

It is an enthusiasm, however, that endures only for a while. Let Death present his keen-edged scythe a few times and the instinct of self-preservation returns with its impelling force, the feeling for the herd becomes subordinate, and the glamour of voluntarily accepted tragedy fades!

This detracts nothing, however, from the stupendous force of this feeling and its associated emotions. Arising from one or another accidental circumstance it overthrows all established standards of thinking and acting, overwhelms the intelligence, intoxicates the emotions, and exalts anew the ancient words, "*Dulce et decorum est pro patria mori.*" The consuming fire of this passion can be compared only to that of love and both are linked together in the supreme purpose of race preservation.

Viewed from this angle, the problem of ending war assumes massive proportions. The human imagination is a feeble instrument indeed in devising schemes that will imbue peace with this fire. Persecution has done it. We recall the early Christian martyrs with their philosophy of passive non-resistance. Were they not also swayed by the impulse of voluntarily accepted tragedy? These men who opposed the shedding of blood, gloried in having their own blood shed!

Possibly of such stuff in our time is the passive non-resistance movement in India.

Perchance in some distant day the age-old fight against man's natural enemies, disease germs and parasites, will stir up such an emotion and with popular feeling inflamed to the pitch of action men will come forward and with bared breasts offer their bodies for experiment. There stands in the City of Havana, Cuba a monument in memory of men who did this very thing, yielded their lives in the doing and as a result the great scourge of yellow fever is disappearing from the world. No epic of a soldier on the battle-field makes the pulse beat faster than the story of such a sacrifice. "Going over the top" with a cheer and a stomach full of Jamaica rum is undoubtedly a brave act. Calmly crawling into a bed befouled by a patient suffering from fever, jaundice and "black vomiting", sleeping with the patient, being inoculated with the patient's blood, and finally offering one's body for the bite of an infected mosquito are deeds equally heroic!

It is a long way to the attainment of self-knowledge sufficient to evaluate properly this phenomenon of voluntarily accepted tragedy. Its consideration induces a proper attitude of humility towards the subject of war and peace.

IV

"It is a calumny on men to say that they are roused to heroic action by ease, hope of pleasure, recompense, — sugar plums of any kind in this world or the next! In the meanest mortal there lies something nobler. . . . Difficulty, abnegation, martyrdom, death are the allurements that act on the heart of man."

—THOMAS CARLYLE.

Where there are many cures, there is no cure — is an ancient aphorism of the art of healing which may well include the movement against the art of war. One has but to ask for a cure for war and a thousand cures are offered over night. A thousand cures and there should be but one!

The healing art, however, further teaches that in the absence of a specific remedy a cure may sometimes be affected by means of symptomatic treatment, even in cases where symptoms are numerous and treatment is complicated. Applying this teaching to the prevention of war, there may be found among the thousands of panaceas many vital principles of treatment, which understood and properly applied, will achieve an end that seems so hopeless of attainment.

In the latter spirit and with our minds fully aware of the fact that we are discussing one measure in a vastly complicated treatment, let us consider the idea of the influence of sublimation upon the urge of war.

It is not necessary to discuss the various inciting causes of war, the interferences with man's food, possessions and ideals, which are almost too numerous to mention. They may be grouped under the word thwarting to form the aforementioned stimulus — emotion — action syndrome, thwarting — anger — fighting. Every effort must be made and is being made to remove from the society of nations all thwarting relations and conditions. Anger with its fighting reactions will not then be so often stimulated.

Such obvious steps as a league of nations, a federated union of democracies, renunciation of war pacts, world court, etc., should be pushed to the limit of national and community safety and thus prove or disprove their worth. They may limit war between nations. They will not achieve perpetual peace. We need not worry with William James over the ennui of a pacific civilization. Long before the ennui has become very trying a real lively rebellion will break out somewhere. History records that many a good war has nipped in the bud many a bad rebellion — for no quarrels are worse than family quarrels.

“Fellow be with kindly foeman
Rather than with friend unkind.
Friend and foeman are distinguished
Not by title, but by mind.”

The removal, however, of all active causes of war is a job of enormous complexity, which may never be finished. Is it not the part of wisdom to seek in addition measures that will deal with the second and third members of the syndrome — measures that will make men slower to anger and content with conflict that does not end with the death and mutilation of the opponent?

An all-wise Providence has provided that man's instinctive tendencies must be either expressed, repressed or sublimated. Thus far in the history of the race the complex of instinctive tendencies associated with war has had very free expression. It has been a history of self-preservation through continuous struggle and strife, at first of the individual and family, then of the tribe, and now of large nations.

More recent knowledge in the field of analytic psychology shows the indestructability of these primitive impulses. *The mechanism of their handling in a civilized state are facts that must be considered in any discussion as to how to end war.* The primitive instincts of man still surging in him for expression are buried in unconsciousness, morbidly changed, or raised into new form by the moral censor of civilized life *but never destroyed.* It matters not whether sex or self-preservation is the basis for an instinctive action. The facts that count are that an instinct is indestructible and may be transformed. As Havelock Ellis states, “Freud's work is the revelation in the spiritual world of that transformation and conservation of energy which half a century earlier had been demonstrated in the physical world.”

This new evaluation of human conduct teaches that, for good or ill and for many thousands of years to come, man is to be harassed by his primitive impulses which, if not properly handled, will perchance defeat his highest ethical strivings. But the new psychology further teaches man that there is a mechanism of transference, a process of sublimation, a method of satisfying primitive instincts by turning them into channels of the highest social order that has been consciously and unconsciously used by him.

W. H. R. Rivers, late Professor in Natural Science, in Cambridge, England, in his book *Instinct and the Unconscious* well describes the mechanism in the following words:

“Sublimation is a process which not only forms one of the chief therapeutic agencies by means of which we try to meet the failures of repression but is one which underlies success in all the higher accomplishments of life especially in art, science and religion. In this process the energy arising out of conflict is directed from some channel which leads in a social or anti-

social direction, and turned into one leading to an end connected with the higher ideals of society.

"We have," he continues, "reason to believe that the person who has attained perfection of balance in the control of his instinctive tendencies, in whom the processes of repression and sublimation have become wholly effective, may thereby become completely adapted to his environment and attain a highly peaceful and stable existence."

An easily understood example of this is the sublimation of the maternal instinct in woman by nursing and social welfare work. In this manner the strongest instinct in a woman's life, if denied expression, may be very easily and satisfactorily adjusted, both for the benefit of the woman herself and of society.

Another example that is much to the point is the successful abolishment of rowdiness and the gang spirit from our colleges by means of organized athletics.

Sublimation plays a most important part in the life of every individual; an importance that increases directly with the complexity and artificiality of civilized life. It is the alchemy in the realm of the soul. The best that man has done is because of it, the best that lies ahead will be achieved by means of it. Combined with the long period of human infancy it is what makes man "morally, socially and economically educable".

Is there any reason to doubt that the group fighting impulses cannot be likewise sublimated? Is there any reason to doubt that these pugnacious feelings now let loose on so vast a scale and with such destructive effect cannot be curbed and turned into other channels?

Repression is but a temporary expedient, a giver of false hopes, an obstacle that unsupported by sublimation dams back the flood only for a time and makes the destruction more cataclysmic. It travels rough-shod over man's instincts and, as has been demonstrated often in the case of the individual, brings on a train of evils of its own.

The biologist and psychologist are united on the subjects of the indestructibility of the primitive instincts and the possibility of sublimating them. The biologist has traced changes in the functioning of animal instincts over long periods of time by the slow process of non-intelligent adaptation. There is no reason to doubt that such changes may be established more quickly as the result of intelligent effort. The psychologist shows over and over again the power of man, consciously and unconsciously, satisfactorily to repress and sublimate his most powerful primitive impulses. Pierre Bovet in *L'Instinct Combatif* writes, "War may be sublimated into the highest form of social and spiritual activity!"

With the anger emotion and the fighting instinct repressed and sublimated, man will be slower to take offense, slower to precipitate the struggle

of arms when a *casus belli* arises, less liable at the call of the demagogue to plunge into war. He will be satisfied with phantasies of conflict that do not involve war. He will be more amenable to reason, more willing to discuss and arbitrate, more likely to accept peaceful settlements.

The great question then arises: What shall be the form of sublimation? What species of conflict without violence, what human activity or interest or institution gives most promise of attaining the much to be desired end?

Naturally one turns first of all to religion. Surely here may be found the means to peace. The spirit of religion is almost universal, its organized bodies are international in scope. All teach moral restraint and inhibition, self-denial and humility and to a greater or less degree love of one's fellows. What more natural than to have "Moral Rearmament" and religion marching shoulder to shoulder? Surely the fighting instincts can be well sublimated, struggling with avarice, greed, hatred, malice, and all the lusts of the flesh.

All of which sounds very true but the fact remains that it has been tried and has been found wanting. Intolerance and bigotry and the introduction of political and business methods into its activities have actually rendered religion an additional incentive to war and sadly diminished its effectiveness for peace. Indeed organized religion has been the very instigator of wars and has tried to spread its doctrines by means of wars, holy wars, — one of the greatest contradictions in the use of words. No wars have been more cruel than those waged in the name of religion. The founder of Christianity with a vision of the future said, "Think not that I am come to send peace on earth, I came not to send peace but a sword." The founder of Mohammedanism taught his followers that the killing of an infidel made the slayer's chances of heaven more secure and there are 209,000,000 people in the world today who may believe this.

A black picture indeed, but there shine out like stars in the night the lives of those whose baser passions have been sublimated by religion, those who have been able to pluck from religion that which is divine and have transmuted the dross of their lower natures into fine gold. There are a few such among the acquaintances of every man. They show that the spirit of religion has not failed; it is man and his conception and materialization of religion that has failed. Perhaps religion is too high a form of sublimation for the vast majority. They give it lip service, nothing else. Nevertheless, we must hold to it, hold to it with undying hope, and in the years to come in the manhood of mankind, the sublimating influence of religion, pure and undefiled, will redeem the world.

There are evidences of the sublimation of the fighting impulses in most of the activities of civilized life. The arts, of course, with their crea-

tive possibilities are sublimating agents of the highest type which demand, however special aptitudes.

The front trenches of the fields of science offer many ideal sublimations — but only for the few.

Business and commerce are universal in scope and have many of the elements of conflict, but, unfortunately, as carried on at present, their practice tends to interfere with other people's food and possessions — they thwart and stimulate anger — and so become a cause for war. Education, the struggle to train the mind and acquire knowledge, has sublimating possibilities, but there is little emotional content in the accumulation of facts and, as George Eliot says in *Adam Bede*, "It isn't notions set people doing the right thing, it's feelings." Indeed, intelligence is but a tool in the hands of the passions. Freud clearly summarizes this relation in these words, "Students of human nature and philosophers have long ago taught us that we do wrong to value our intelligence as an independent force and to overlook its dependence upon our emotional life. Psycho-analytic experience is in a position to prove every day that the cleverest people suddenly behave as intelligently as defectives as soon as their understanding encounters emotional resistance."

In *Essays in Wartime*, Havelock Ellis discusses Professor James' *Moral Equivalent of War*. He goes even further than James in claiming that under civilized conditions "there are hundreds of avocations which furnish exactly the same conditions as warfare for the cultivation of all the manly virtues of enterprise and courage and endurance, physical and moral."

Surely of all these avocations none fits better into the scheme of civilized living, none tends so well to maintain the best of martial virtues, as *sport* and the *spirit* of *sportsmanship*.

V

"The evils of war are obvious enough. Could not the virtues of war, animal courage, discipline and self-knowledge, together with gaiety and enthusiasm find some harmless occasion for their development?"

"Such a harmless simulacrum of war is seen in sport In war, states wish to be efficient in order to conquer but in sport men wish to prove their excellence because they wish to have it. Sport is a liberal form of war stripped of its compulsions and malignity; a rational art and the expression of a civilized instinct."

—GEORGE SANTAYANA in *The Life of Reason*.

Sport is in many respects the physiological equivalent of war, both from the viewpoint of the training of the body and of the body's reaction to emotional stimuli. With its principle of representation and the ease with which it becomes an expression of patriotism, international sport is in many respects the moral equivalent of war. With the exception of the fulfillment of the death wish, we may almost say that international sport is the psychological equivalent of war. Furthermore, it supplies in good measure the thrills that humanity craves not only in those who play but in those who watch. All the outward physiological manifestations of the struggle are found in the bodies of the spectators. As shown by W. B. Cannon in his monograph *"Bodily Changes in Pain, Hunger, Fear and Rage"*, a comparative study of the physiological behavior of man and the lower animals under the strain of intense emotional excitement shows a striking similarity. An animal in fighting mood and a football team, including substitutes not playing in the game, all show the same physiological processes of increased adrenal output and sugar in the urine. Before the New York Academy of Medicine in 1914, Cannon advocated the directing of the fighting instinct into the channel of organized athletics and urged increased participation in international sport.

But most important of all is the spiritual influence of sportsmanship. Like religion, sport has its moral restraints and inhibitions, its discipline and self-denial. It has codes of honor and standards of conduct that develop the finest elements of character.

There are those well qualified to speak who hold that the English sports tradition had its inception in the days of chivalry, that the field of honor with its inviolate rules inspired many of the moral concepts that later

became associated by the same ruling class with sports competition. Oxford and Cambridge and the great public schools, the educational institutions patronized by this class, most naturally absorbed the same sports traditions.

Thus from the chivalric contests was transplanted the code that dominated sport. The days of chivalry have passed, but their traditions on the field of sport remain.

The establishment of universal sport as a dominating influence in human life must begin with the training in the spirit of sportsmanship of the very young. This training must begin in the home — even in the nursery. In being taught to share its toys, the infant is having one of its first vital experiences in team play. In the home and school the men and women selected as teachers and leaders in sport must be individuals of the highest character and integrity. The vision of building beautiful bodies and of upholding the honor of their country on the playing field against the nations of the world must be kept before the young and their *phantasies of conflict stimulated with this vision rather than that of war*. Repression and sublimation must begin in youth.

At the opening reception of the Harvard Graduate School of Education, George E. Johnson delivered an address on "*Teaching Children to Fight*" in which he showed the sublimating effect of free and competitive games on the pugnacious instincts of children. He said, "A game is one of the most idealistic activities of life. Why do boys exert themselves to the utmost in a ball game straining every nerve and muscle and testing to the limit every manly quality? To make 'runs', 'goals', 'scores' to be sure. But why make scores? Do they take them home? Do they eat them? Do they wear them? Do they sell them? Do they store them away in safety vaults? There are nothing but ideals in a true game. Good ideals. Be strong, plucky, efficient, fair, honest, do your darndest in the place where you can serve your group the best. Play offers some of the best opportunities for teaching children and youths to fight in ways to conserve the heroic qualities of man, to develop some of the noblest social traits and to make for peace and progress throughout the world. These plays and games plus the impressionability and impetus of youth are more effective in determining character than actual war which, with its maturer soldiers, must to a large extent use the moral qualities available rather than develop them."

In every school competitive games, particularly *representative* competitive games, must be part of the curriculum. *Representative competitive* sport more nearly symbolizes the conflict of war. In *competitive* sport, as C. W. Kennedy of Princeton has pointed out, it is necessary for an individual "to mobilize at a given time and a given place all the skill and intelligence and courage that he possesses, to do this in the face of the most strenuous opposition and to do it with a smile and a cool head." *Representative* sport demands an additional responsibility. In playing a game in which the

players represent only themselves, the character of the play reflects only on the players. Poor physical condition, errors in judgment, bad sportsmanship reflect solely on themselves. But if they are representing their club or village or class or school, a new situation arises in which there is responsibility to a group. The character of the play reflects on the reputation of the group and loyalty to the herd raises the standard of play to meet this responsibility.

The anti-social spirit in competitive sport, with its personal superiority and inferiority characteristics and its exploitation of the successful, will no longer be a problem where there is proper training in the spirit of sportsmanship. Up to the age of thirty, *representative competitive* sport of the individual's choice for an hour or so daily for a certain portion of the year should be compulsory.

The wonderful sublimating influence of nature study, the Boy Scouts, the Woodcraft League, Camp Fire Girls, summer camps, and other similar organizations must be exercised universally. Also for a certain period of adolescent years the dedication of the child to the service of the state in manual work against the forces of nature should be required.

In connection with the teaching of sport, the teaching of elementary school history must be given particular consideration. The present school histories and also juvenile war literature must be largely deleted of their battles and bloodshed, intrigue and double dealing, and rewritten with the idea of emphasizing careers of the creative spirits of the world rather than the destructive. Our teachers, having learned all the dates and all the battles and controversies of the world since the year one, will have to junk their stock in trade and start anew to teach things that profit the inner life and give youth a vision of the ethical strivings of mankind.

The importance of this training of the young cannot be over-estimated. What was said by Socrates many years ago concerning this very question is still true: "We ought to esteem it of the greatest importance that the stories which children first hear should be adapted in the most perfect manner to the promotion of virtue."

There should be the closest sympathy between true sportsmanship and true religion. The organized bodies of religion should cultivate this sympathy by stimulating among their members interest in sport and the spirit of sportsmanship. Indeed, the code of honor of a true sportsman is but a modern edition of the ten commandments. Thus the moral principles inculcated by religion will be vitalized at first hand and made an integral part of the daily life of the young and a big step forward will have been taken in overcoming the present apathy towards the Church.

Furthermore it would require the formation with the other nations of the world of an International Sports Association, which we will hereafter

call the I.S.A. This association, building on the foundation already laid by the Olympic Games Committee, would have the entire direction and control of international sports. It would be administered by a committee, or governing board, consisting of three members from each country, and would have its own budget, subscribed to by the respective governments pro rata according to population. The three members would be appointed by the chief executives of each country for a term of six years, except the first appointments would be of such duration that one new appointment would be made every two years thereafter.

The members of the I.S.A. committee would devote all their time with singleness of purpose to the association; their salaries, paid by their respective governments, being adequate to obtain men and women of the highest type. They would elect their own officers and meet several times each year. The permanent headquarters would be at Geneva, Switzerland, and temporary headquarters in the capital of the nation holding the games. The committee would decide on the list of sports for each year and all matters connected therewith. The word sport is used in its most general sense. Every endeavor would be made to keep untarnished the real meaning of the word "sportsmanship." The nearest Greek word "eidos" conveys the idea of "reverence, modesty, courtesy, scrupulous sense of honor, and fairness." There is also a colloquial, sublimating use of the word sport that has significance. We say to our boy who has hurt himself, "Be a soldier"; he grits his teeth and bears the pain. We say to him, "Be a sport", and he laughs the pain away.

The sports would include everything that we now have under that name meeting with the approval of the I.S.A. Committee and anything new that might be devised. The development of boxing and the American game of football would receive special attention, *particularly the latter with its man-to-man struggle, its team work, its tactics and strategy.* The martial virtues of hardihood and contempt of softness, a cool head and obedience to command will not suffer at the hands of football. John Poe, the famous Princeton football player, was last seen alive in a charge on the enemies' trenches under severe shell fire. The man next to him, a Frenchman, reported that he last saw Poe running forward well bent over, *muttering numbers* quietly to himself!

The competing teams would be chosen in each country by a selection committee of that country, consisting of three authorities in each line of sport. These authorities would be appointed by the three members of the I.S.A. committee, who would be the final judges in disputes relating to selection of competitors. Complete try-outs and preliminary competitions in each line of sport with free admission to spectators would be held in each country. Each competitor would be a native or naturalized citizen of the country he represents and have resided there ten years. There would be no distinction

between professional and amateur. The traveling and living expenses of the competitors would be paid by their respective governments. Besides the usual prizes of the I.S.A., there would be special medals given by each government for particularly meritorious performances of any of its representatives. The rules for each contest would be most carefully drawn up and disputes immediately adjudicated by a special body of the I. S. A. committee. Individual contestants in the games would be limited to four years competition.

The sports would take place each year and be assigned to different nations in rotation. They would be reported simultaneously throughout the world by radio so that the whole world might listen and feel the thrill of struggle.

The country holding the sports would also hold a world's fair in connection therewith, the expenses of this being borne by all governments pro rata according to population. From all parts of the world would come the products of man's mind and industry in art, literature, music, commerce, trade, science to meet in fair competition, the best to receive the prizes.

Besides conducting the routine affairs of the association, the committee would act as a research organization, with the aim of discovering and inventing new sports and new means to sublimate war.

It would inaugurate annual international contests in exploration and discovery that would demand the utmost in human stamina, skill, courage and fortitude. These would include such activities, for instance, as the scaling of hitherto unclimbed peaks among the world's highest mountain ranges; the crossing of unknown portions of the great deserts of the world; safari races traversing equatorial Africa from coast to coast; airplane flights around the world on new and untried courses; snowshoe, skiing and dog sled expeditions across the Antarctic continent or along the northern Siberian coast.

In such a fashion would peace be changed. It is true the sublimations of sport do not fulfill all the postulates of Elie Faure, particularly the creative risks of war and the atmosphere of voluntarily accepted tragedy. There seems, however, no other human activity that gives better augury of success in handling the emotion of anger and the instinct of fighting than sport and the spirit of sportsmanship.

There are, of course those who hold that international athletic contests will so frequently end in bitter controversies and quarrels as to increase international ill-will and even provoke war. Any contest has in it potentialities of a quarrel, and sport without a code of honor and without the spirit of sportsmanship would have little to recommend it. But with the spread of international sport throughout the world goes the spirit of sportsmanship and the definite ideals of conduct that are a part of it, and the spirit of sportsmanship does not countenance a quarrel.

There are those also who will view with sternly critical eye other possible imperfections in this plan, imperfections that human weakness and folly can inject into any scheme of living. They may see in it the proselyting of athletes, the introduction of politics into sport, the downfall of amateurism, the deification of the large body and the small head, the nations driven sports-mad. To this there is an answer.

Turning our gaze to the past, we find an ancient nation that dedicated itself beyond all else to the cultivation of the strength and beauty of the body, that gloried in the contests of sport and sportsmanship, that erected altars and offered sacrifices to the successful athlete, that "considered an Olympian prize the crown of human happiness" and at the same time developed a culture supreme in art, in science, in the appreciation of truth and beauty and in the attainment of the highest attributes of the mind and the spirit. Under the aegis of sport the "sacred armistice" was instituted that called a halt to the conflict of war during the month of the Olympiad. A feeble sublimation, it is true, but in a world of barbarism sport was of necessity ancillary to war. It was of these people that the spy of Cyrus, the Persian King reported, "Against what sort of men hast thou led us, O King, who contest not for money but for honor?"

The world may not yet be sufficiently enlightened to accomplish the sublimation of war through sport or anything else, but is it not reasonable to suggest that after the lapse of twenty-five hundred years it is time to try again a method that holds out so much of promise and in the crucible of experience see what will happen?

Is not international sport with well-established principles of conduct an ideal worth striving for? Is there not hope that ideals universally inculcated on the playing field will spread like gentle leaven throughout the mass of mankind? What better training in the control of anger can be found than in the school of sportsmanship of which one ideal is calmness in the midst of conflict? "He that is slow to anger is better than the mighty, and he that controlleth his spirit than he that taketh a city."

"Sport, which still keeps the flag of idealism flying, is perhaps the most saving grace in the world at the moment, with its spirit of rules kept and regard for the adversary, whether the fight is going for or against. When, if ever, the fairplay spirit of sport reigns over international affairs, the cat force which rules there now will slink away and human life emerge for the first time from the jungle."

JOHN GALSWORTHY.

Appendix

To avoid interfering with continuity of thought foot note references are omitted. Below are additional references not given in the text.

The Origin and Evolution of Life, *Henry Fairfield Osborn*. New York.

Social Psychology of International Conduct, *G. M. Stratton*.

Germany and the Next War, *F. von Bernhardi*. New York.

War as an Instrument of National Policy, *James G. Shotwell*. New York.

The Neurosis of the Nations, *L. E. Playne*. New York.

Non-Resistance in New England, *Merle E. Austin*, New England Quarterly, January 1929.

Voltaire, *Victor Thaddeus*. New York.

Human Biology and Racial Welfare, *E. V. Coudry*.

Inevitable War, *Richard Stockton*.

Psychology of War, *J. T. MacCurdy*. Boston.

History of Christian Church, *Schaff*.

The Bible.

The Philosophy of the Enlightenment, *John Grier Hibben*. New York.

Encyclopedia Britannica. New York 1929.

Story of Philosophy, *Will Durant*. New York.

Principles of Social Reconstruction, *Bertrand Russell*.

Memories and Studies, *William James*. New York.

War Birds, *Diary of an Unknown Author*. New York.

Poems of Allan Seagar. New York.

Herd Instinct, *Wilfred Trotter*, The Sociological Review 1908.

The Life of Reason, Reason in Society, *George Santayana*, New York.

Teaching Children to Fight, *George E. Johnson*, Harvard Alumni Bulletin, Boston, February 26, 1925.

Have College Athletics an Educational Value? *Charles W. Kennedy*, Princeton Alumni Weekly, January 14, 1925.

6. 5 + 1

